



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Trinity and TD Jakes

Trinity and TD Jakes, on: 2005/6/15 18:28

I looking at another thread and this is something i didn't understand.

What is the difference between the Trinity and saying this "...One God, but manifest in...three different ways, Father in c reation, Son in redemption, Holy Spirit in regeneration." (obviously a quote from TD Jakes).

What is the Difference between the Trinity and saying that??

I'm confused, need help...

Re: Trinity and TD Jakes - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/15 19:48

Quote:
-----What is the difference between the Trinity and saying this "...One God, but manifest in...three different ways, Father in creation, So n in redemption, Holy Spirit in regeneration." (obviously a quote from TD Jakes).

What is the Difference between the Trinity and saying that??
-----

There are reasonable people on both sides who when pressed to be specific and explain this end up confessing: "It is a mystery."

The term trinity was coined by Tertullian long after the apostles were gone. So the term is non-essential for saving faith i n Christ.

There are NOT three Gods. We know that.

We also cannot say that the Son = the Father since Jesus said in essence: the Father > the Son. Not logically correct.

The Scriptures make no claim of "mystery" for a Trinity. The mystery of godliness has to do with God being manifest in t he flesh. (1 Tim. 3:16) Ponder on THAT, and you will begin understanding the godhead better.

Listen to one of the bishops set in place by the apostles themselves:

Ignatius: A.D. 30-107

Epistle to the Trallians.

CHAPTER VI

"For they speak of Christ, not that they may preach Christ, but that they may reject Christ; and they speak of the law, not that they may establish the law, but that they may proclaim things contrary to it. For they alienate Christ from the Father, and the law from Christ. They also calumniate His being born of the Virgin; they are ashamed of His cross; they deny Hi s passion; and they do not believe His resurrection. They introduce God as a Being unknown; they suppose Christ to be unbegotten; and as to the Spirit, they do not admit that He exists. Some of them say that the Son is a mere man, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are but the same person, and that the creation is the work of God, not by Christ , but by some other strange power."

Notice that very early the apostolic teaching was against there being "one person." But our word "person" can take on a bit different connotation than the Greek. Of course this is not Scripture. But a very good witness it is indeed.

This is from Justin Martyr AD 110-165:

"And Jesus the Christ, because the Jews knew not what the Father was, and what the Son, in like manner accused them; and Himself said, "No one knoweth the Father, but the Son; nor the Son, but the Father, and they to whom the Son revealeth Him." Now the Word of God is His Son, as we have before said. And He is called Angel and Apostle; for He declares whatever we ought to know, and is sent forth to declare whatever is revealed; as our Lord Himself says, "He that heareth Me, heareth Him that sent Me." From the writings of Moses also this will be manifest; for thus it is written in them, "And the Angel of God spake to Moses, in a flame of fire out of the bush, and said, I am that I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of thy fathers; go down into Egypt, and bring forth My people." And if you wish to learn what follows, you can do so from the same writings; for it is impossible to relate the whole here. But so much is written for the sake of proving that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and His Apostle, being of old the Word, and appearing sometimes in the form of fire, and sometimes in the likeness of angels; but now, by the will of God, having become man for the human race, He endured all the sufferings which the devils instigated the senseless Jews to inflict upon Him; who, though they have it expressly affirmed in the writings of Moses, "And the angel of God spake to Moses in a flame of fire in a bush, and said, I am that I am, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," yet maintain that He who said this was the Father and Creator of the universe. Whence also the Spirit of prophecy rebukes them, and says, "Israel doth not know Me, my people have not understood Me." And again, Jesus, as we have already shown, while He was with them, said, "No one knoweth the Father, but the Son; nor the Son but the Father, and those to whom the Son will reveal Him." The Jews, accordingly, being throughout of opinion that it was the Father of the universe who spake to Moses, though He who spake to him was indeed the Son of God, who is called both Angel and Apostle, are justly charged, both by the Spirit of prophecy and by Christ Himself, with knowing neither the Father nor the Son. For they who affirm that the Son is the Father, are proved neither to have become acquainted with the Father, nor to know that the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God. And of old He appeared in the shape of fire and in the likeness of an angel to Moses and to the other prophets; but now in the times of your reign, having, as we before said, become Man by a virgin, according to the counsel of the Father, for the salvation of those who believe on Him, He endured both to be set at nought and to suffer, that by dying and rising again He might conquer death."

RT

Re: Form and substance - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/6/15 21:24

Quote:  
 -----What is the difference between the Trinity and saying this ""...One God, but manifest in...three different ways, Father in creation, Son in redemption, Holy Spirit in regeneration."" (obviously a quote from TD Jakes).  
 -----

Jakes believes in an idea that I've understood to be termed "modalism". Modalism is the idea that the same thing or person can take on different forms but never be separate forms. Modalists believe these different forms can be consecutive but never coexistent.

For instance the ice/water/steam metaphor is rather modalistic if we are talking about one glass of water becoming either ice or steam. Another darker example of modalism is found in the myth of Dracula where the count can change into a bat or even vapor. When I was growing up there were some cartoon superheroes called the "Wonder Twins." They would put their rings together and say something like "Form of a...tiger!" and transform into a tiger. ...animated modalism? :-D

Orthodox Trinitarians reject modalism because they believe in separate but equal coexistent persons. We know that Jesus was more than a mere morph of God because He said He was going back to the Father...to sit at His right hand. The fact that Jesus talked to the Father is an obvious indication of their separateness. Also, if Jesus is only a shape-shifted manifestation of the Father, then He is in effect only a created being instead of the Lamb pre-existent with God before creation itself.

I've read many apologetics for the importance of the Trinity but most never seem to stick in my head very well. I have always sensed that the essential reason the Trinity is so important to the Gospel has something to do with the cross and the atonement. Jesus had to be perfectly and completely God to be the spotless lamb who could rise from the dead and ascend to the Throne, yet He had to be set apart from the Father in order to take upon Himself the sins of the World. Th

ere are more complete explanations but that one has always satisfied my curiosity...

MC

**Re:, on: 2005/6/15 23:51**

Quote:

-----  
Compton wrote:

Modalism is the idea that the same thing or person can take on different forms but never be separate forms. Modalists believe these different forms can be consecutive but never coexistent.  
-----

That helped me alot.

Well, so 'Oneness Pentacostals' and TD Jakes, dont believe in Omni-Presence of God (being in more than one place at once)??

Raising up the debate 'who was Jesus praying to'?

Hmm thats a co-existence..right?

**Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/6/16 0:07**

To add to Compton's reply I would add that a very critical element is missing from Jakes explanation of his belief of the Godhead. You will never hear the words Co-equal, or Co-eternal. For Jakes, the Father *is* the Son *is* the Holy Spirit...etc.

The Trinity is the proper way to describe God because it's the truth. Deut. 6:4 which states "the Lord our God the LORD is one," contains in it a hint at a plurality in the Godhead. The Hebrew word used for "one" is echad, which is used in Hebrew to describe a group being united as one. John chapter one is the clarion passage for Trinitarians.

"In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with the God and God was the Word."

In the Greek there is a definite article in front of the first rendering of Theos (God). The second reference to Theos identifying Him as also being the Word is missing the definite article. This is significant in that it identifies two distinct persons BOTH called God. If the definite article were present in the second rendering then this passage would only be talking about one person and modalists would be right.

This is an important doctrine because the root of almost all heresy begins in a misunderstanding of the identity of God. Without the trinity there is no Son to sacrifice, and no Father to receive the sacrifice. The prayers of Christ make no sense...etc.

Hope this helps,

In Christ,  
Jeremy Hulsey

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/16 3:45**

RT writes:

Quote:

-----Listen to one of the bishops set in place by the apostles themselves:

Ignatius: A.D. 30-107

-----

Speculation. There is no record of the apostles having done this and Ignatius' view of 'monarchical bishops' is certainly not shared by Paul and Peter.

Here's a one page devotion on (<http://www.biblebased.co.uk/ftp/RonBailey/trinity.pdf>) Trinity that I wrote for a catholic school assembly!

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/16 9:12**

A way that has helped me apprehend the Trinity is by observation of the creation concerning His eternal power and Godhead.

All of our universe boils down to 3 things:

- 1) Space
- 2) Matter
- 3) Time

This is a Trinity

- 1) Space exists as L x W x H

This is a Trinity.

Length is not width. Width is not height. Height is not length but they are ALL **SPACE**

- 2) Matter exists as:

- a) solid
- b) liquid
- c) gas

This is a Trinity.

Solid is not liquid. liquid is not gas. Gas is not solid. But they are all **MATTER**

- 3) Time exists as:

- a) Past
- b) Present
- c) Future

This is a Trinity. Past is not the present. Present is not the future. Future is not the past. But they are all **TIME**.

Re:, on: 2005/6/16 10:21

Quote:

-----  
RobertW wrote:  
This is a Trinity.

Solid is not liquid. liquid is not gas. Gas is not solid. But they are all **MATTER**

This is a Trinity. Past is not the present. Present is not the future. Future is not the past. But they are all **TIME**.

-----  
This sounds in error. Even though that what you said is true, but when you apply it to the Trinity its void.

The Father IS NOT the Son, The Son IS NOT the Holy Spirit, The Holy Spirit IS NOT the Father. Is the way you are pertraying this.

Okay. So TD Jakes and Oneness Pentacostals believe WHAT contray to us. (i guess trinty ppl..)

We(me 2) believe the Trinity is... 'Co-equal, Co-existant, Co-eternal'.

Now, what is TD/Oneness believe that they are ...what? that differ them from us.

I know they believe 'you must speak in tounges to go to heaven'..and that crap.

But about the Trinity. What's the difference between what TD Jakes said...and what we say

"...One God, but manifest in...three different ways, Father in creation, Son in redemption, Holy Spirit in regeneration" TD Jakes

"Father/Son/Holy Spirit are all Co-existant, Co-equal, Co-eternal" Us (trinity people)

My question, \*i like straight forward answers..and a parable might help..if possible..lol\*

Is.. What is the difference between those to statements.

Re: - posted by couch (), on: 2005/6/16 10:26

Yshua,

I believe what Robert was highlighting in those examples (thank you for those brother!) was the clear difference as stated here:

Modalists reject the idea that although God is one in nature, He is three in personage. They would maintain that God is one being who morphs back and forth between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, depending on the situation - but is never all three existing at the same time in full, equal existence.

In other words we believe there are three "whos" and one "what". One God, co-equal and co-existing in three personages who are altogether unique yet altogether one.

Modalists would say that three do not exist simultaneously, only one exists at a time, yet is fully God. We reject this because God can not be "fully God" unless He is shown as the complete "us" as is in Genesis: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, together as three persons in one Godhead.

Hope this helps...

Re:, on: 2005/6/16 10:47

Quote:

-----  
couch wrote:

Modalists reject the idea that although God is one in nature, He is three in personage. They would maintain that God is one being who morphs back and forth between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, depending on the situation - but is never all three existing at the same time in full, equal existence.

Hope this helps...  
-----

This DID help.

So, again no one said 'Yes, Oneness/TD both believe that there is no Co-existence'.

I understand now. Finally... (sometimes i need to be beat over the head with something).

Here is another question, same topic. Can God use TD Jakes? If he believes such lies? This is a bit of a weird question now, but it seems like God is getting the glory..right? or is he like Benny Hinn but in a different way.

Meaning, 'alot of show', and some Glory to God.

Re: Trinity and TD Jakes - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2005/6/16 11:00

Fairly simple difference, in that Jakes believes that there is one God, and has manifested (or shown himself) in three forms... God the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

Trinitarians believe that God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are three separate beings, co-equal and co-eternal, and all three are God.

Without disputing or cutting down anyone's doctrine, that's a fairly simple definition of both views... :)

J

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/16 11:04

Quote:

-----The Father IS NOT the Son, The Son IS NOT the Holy Spirit, The Holy Spirit IS NOT the Father. Is the way you are portraying this.  
-----

You left out the last part:

But they are all **God**. Elohyim.

See my article (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1993>) "ONE 'Yachid' or one 'Echad'?".

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2005/6/16 11:04**

Didn't see this post, sorry...

Jakes doesn't believe there is co-existence because he doesn't believe that God is three separate persons, but one person, one being. How can you co-exist with yourself?

God CAN and DOES use Jakes in a mighty way.

Hope this helps explain the confusion a bit...

J

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/16 11:07**

Quote:

-----Here is another question, same topic. Can God use TD Jakes? If he believes such lies? This is a bit of a weird question now, but it seems like God is getting the glory..right? or is he like Benny Hinn but in a different way.

Meaning, 'a lot of show', and some Glory to God.

-----  
All error begins with a misunderstanding of God. A question was posed a while back whether or not genuine revival has ever flowed from the Oneness Camp. As far as I know no one answered that.

**Re: - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2005/6/16 11:11**

...everything that we know about revival has come from the oneness camp. It started in Acts 2, then moved to Samaria, and all over the world.

If that's not revival, then I don't want it. I prefer to let scripture define us and what revival is rather than the sad movements (in comparison) that we have today...

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/16 12:07**

Quote:

-----If that's not revival, then I don't want it. I prefer to let scripture define us and what revival is rather than the sad movements (in comparison) that we have today...

-----  
Does this mean you reject all the classical revivals in known history where, so as we can ascertain, they would all have rejected Sabellian Modalism. Are you saying 'you don't want' classical revival because it is not Sabellianism?

**Re:, on: 2005/6/16 15:23**

Robert W, good article.

Hmm what is Sabellianism?? Philologos

**Re: - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2005/6/16 15:30**

As Paul said "I am determined to know nothing among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified", so then I am determined to know nothing but the example as set forth in the word of God.

This doesn't mean I reject the "revivals" that have happened, such as Azusa or Wales or Lewis, etc... but it means that I let the Bible define what I believe and want. If something, as good sounding as it portrays itself, is against the Bible in any way, then I'm against it as well.

That's all I'm saying.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/16 15:39**

The full description of this ancient heresy is (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modalism>) Sabellian Modalism. I thought I would introduce the extra word for folks wanting to research things further.

**Re: - posted by couch (), on: 2005/6/16 16:38**

Zaphycat,

It seems you may be missing the point of this thread. Yeshua wanted to know what Modalism was, and how it was different from the biblical doctrine of the Trinity.

There were a few who helped him with the definition, to which he was satisfied. Then, he asked a follow up question concerning whether or not God could use someone who had such a faulty view of the Trinity.

The question was replied to with the simple response that no true revival has ever come from the camp containing the heresy of modalism, or the "oneness camp".

Your reply sounded odd in that you said that all revival had come from this heretical camp. I am sure this is not what you meant, you probably meant to say that God is one and all revivals came from a true understanding of the Biblical truth that God is one.

Indeed He is one, but when we say "oneness" we are referring to the heresy of modalism, from which I hope you would agree that the bible clearly mitigates against, especially as one who "lets the Bible define what I believe and want."

Modalism, or Sabellian Modalism, or that which springs from the "oneness camp" is heresy; but the Biblical view of the Trinity is truth. Robert's point was that no true revival has sprung out of heresy.

I hope this helps un-muddy the waters...

**Re:, on: 2005/6/16 17:10**

That was a VERY good sum up of the whole thread.

I've never personally experienced 'true revival'. But I have experienced God moving mightily during services, but they (the people) always seemed to fizzle out after them. (Within like 2 weeks, not always immediately).

**Re:, on: 2005/6/16 17:19**

"Adherents of this doctrine are taught that a person cannot be saved unless this person first forsakes his belief in the Trinity and is rebaptized "in the Name of Jesus," according to an interpretation of several scriptures, most notably Acts 2:38."

wowza, that sounds really outta wack. (About Oneness Pentacostals)

and this "According to Oneness Theology, this one God does not have three Persons but rather is exclusively God the Father."

Umm...look at this "The Oneness movement dates back to the early 20th century, in the waning days of the Azusa Street Revival, however it claims its roots and origin had its beginning on the "Day of Pentecost" in the Upper Room in Jerusalem as recorded in the Book of Acts."

I thought this revival was Genuine from the Holy Spirit? So, then maybe God can use 'Oneness' people.



**Re: - posted by couch (), on: 2005/6/16 18:08**

YeshuaismyGd,

Perhaps the Oneness doctrine arose out of the Azusa Street Revival, but notice how it said "at the end". The end of a revival is always interesting to note, what exactly happened to allow the revival to fade away.

Many times the leaders of the revival become filled with pride or sin enters the camp in various ways, and unfortunate things begin to happen. To those truly seeking God, He reveals to them what they are to do and many leave and take the revelation of the majesty and vision of Christ elsewhere.

An example of this is Michael Brown who started the Fire School of Ministry after the Brownsville Revival. After becoming more and more displeased with how the genuine working of the Spirit had depleted into a display of human ability, He left, filled with the fire of God that was there in the early stages of the move of God there.

He felt led to start a school to teach the principles of repentance, holiness, zeal for the lost, missions, and worship in North Carolina. Bob Gladstone, Rita Springer, and others now teach at this school where many awesome things are happening to disciple young people in the ways of God.

This is mere speculation, but its' possible that towards the end of the revival, as man was starting to think He was the reason for "the Glory" (like Lucifer, who as a "jewel" in heaven thought that he himself was brilliant, when in fact it was the resonating glory of Christ reflecting around him) the revival began to fade and men in the deceitfulness of their own hearts started creating new doctrines for themselves.

This could be how that doctrine came about, if it is true that it can be traced to Azusa for an origin. It definitely didn't come from the upper room or at Pentecost.

**Re:, on: 2005/6/16 18:56**

Thanks

Quote:

-----  
couch wrote:

An example of this is Michael Brown who started the Fire School of Ministry after the Brownsville Revival. After becoming more and more displeased with how the genuine working of the Spirit had depleted into a display of human ability, He left, filled with the fire of God that was there in the early stages of the move of God there.

He felt led to start a school to teach the principles of repentance, holiness, zeal for the lost, missions, and worship in North Carolina. Bob Gladstone, Rita Springer, and others now teach at this school where many awesome things are happening to disciple young people in the ways of God.

-----  
Are you saying that Michael Brown and Rita Springer are not being led by the Spirit of God? Or 'stealing God glory'? Cause i dont understand your statement about them.

Thanks for clearing up the Oneness/TD Jakes thing.

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/17 5:42**

Quote:

-----The full description of this ancient heresy is Sabellian Modalism. I thought I would introduce the extra word for folks wanting to research things further.  
-----

I think this is misleading. Even the UPCI (which I disagree with on many things) distances themselves from Sabellianism and Modalism. I collect quite a few books and happen to have several books by David K. Bernard (their main theologian). He makes a distinction between what they believe and Sabellianism and Modalism. And in my humble assessment of his writing, I don't think they are the same. There are important distinctions.

Now this is not an endorsement of what they DO believe. But just wanted to point out that this can be misleading if we are going to lump all oneness pentecostals into this category.

I think on BOTH sides we would do well to stay with the Bible and refrain from explanations that we cannot find CLEAR Biblical teaching for.

RT

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/17 8:43**

RT,

What are the fundamental differences of the author you spoke of and is there a consensus in the UPC camp on this topic? In talking with UPC folk I have worked with they tend to state that God the Father *became* God the Son *became* God the Holy Spirit (Father in Creation, Son in redemption and Holy Spirit in regeneration). They do not have a good working knowledge of the issues other than their attempt to hold to the 'oneness' of God based upon the Shema. I posted a previous answer to this called "One Yachid or One Echad." The word denoted plural unity.

For those who are not aware this entire doctrine sprang up in their camp as a result of R.E McAlister's 'new' doctrine which he suggested to folk that the reason why the Apostles baptised in the name of the "LORD-JESUS-CHRIST" was because that it was a 'code word' for the Trinity (Father-Son-Holy Spirit). This happened in around 1910-1915. *Error begets error*. A man named Frank Ewert took up this doctrine and a tent and the beginnings of Oneness Pentecostalism were sown. He became one of the leading theologians of the "Oneness" Pentecostals as he adopted a 'version' of the Modalist view of the Trinity based upon their misunderstanding of why the Apostles baptised the people in the name of the Lord Jesus. This is VERY VERY important today because the new 'repentance' movement that is coming on in certain camps hold many views dangerously close to UPC. It is my opinion that the reason why the Apostles are said to have baptised in the "name of the Lord Jesus" was to make a distinction between His baptism and John Baptist's baptism. It is beyond this thread at this point to deal with all that, but the ROOT of what TD Jakes and all UPC and Oneness folk hold in terms of the non-Trinitarian doctrine stems from a misunderstanding of baptism in water. Error begets error. Early on these people went around spreading this 'new' doctrine even rebaptizing folk who had been baptized under the Trinitarian formula. It became a very *Christocentric* movement in which a new significance was added to the name LORD.

To make a long story short, the 4th counsel of the Assemblies of God met to deal with this heresy in 1916. Sadly, this forced the Assemblies to finally break down and forge a 'doctrinal statement.' This doctrinal statement essentially split off 25 percent of the near 600 ministers at that time. They went out over the next 30 years and formed various organizations, etc that would eventually come together under the UPCI (United Pentecostal Church Incorporated) and PAW and other smaller ones.

The second major error after a misunderstanding of water baptism that I believe led to this heresy is their misunderstanding of the word 'person'. You simply cannot take a modern understanding of the word 'person' into a Trinitarian debate. The complexity of the issues cannot be simplified like that. And as with so many other attempts to 'simplify the Gospel' fundamental truths get lost and the door to heresy opens. They deny the distinct 'personhood' of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It may be a stretch to say that they believe that God has three 'personalities'- but this is not a Trinitarian view. This is schizophrenia and cannot describe God.

The difference between UPC or Oneness and Sabellianism is that it affirms all three 'manifestations' simultaneously and not chronologically or in linear revelation. While dealing with the issue you will find that the language of the UPC is very similar to that of a Trinitarian. I was once fooled talking to a Oneness Pentecostal thinking our doctrines were the same. You MUST learn to scale the language barrier and know what meanings that a person is pouring into their words. Define your terms. Look out for a statement such as "three manifestations" instead of "three persons."

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/20 11:01**

I was reading Henry Soltau on the Tabernacle, priesthood and offerings when I came across an interesting comment. The early assemblies of the Brethren were torn apart by a controversy that arose over the nature of Christ. It is poignant to read Soltau in this context... having spoken of the blue of the veil as typifying the heavenly and hence divine, and the red as typifying the man he speaks of the purple which is the blending of both...In contemplating Christ, it is well ever to remember the first syllable of His name, as given in Isaiah 9:6 "WONDERFUL" and part of this marvel is, that in Him are combined the deep thoughts and counsels of God, with the feelings and affections of man. In Him there is no incongruity; in the days of His flesh, and on the cross itself, He was 'the same', the "I am", the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today and for ever. He could say, whilst on earth, "the Son which is in the bosom of the Father." When speaking to Nicodemus, in that memorable meeting by night, He said, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." And subsequently, when some of His disciples murmured at the difficulties raised in their carnal minds by His words of life, His answer was - "Doth this offend you? What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" (John 6:6,62) Such words as these, from the lips of the Son of God, should silence our fleshly reasonings, and cause us to bow down and worship, instead of attempting to fathom that which is unfathomable. Vain of our own conceit, we try, with our puny resources, so sound the depths; and fancy, when we have run out our little line, that we have reached the bottom. We cut and square systems of divinity, and stamp, with our imprimatur, as orthodox, the theology of this or that divine; and all the while, lose sight of HIM, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Man can applaud his fellow; for, in so doing, he praises himself. He can approve the sayings of another; for, thereby, he constitutes himself a judge. And thus, in the divinity of the day, we shall find that creeds, confessions of faith, and writings of the Fathers, really assume the place of the Word of God: and orthodoxy consists, not in holding what God says, but in subscribing to articles drawn up by my fallible man."

The analogy of the sounding line is a good one. (Some of you will know this is where Mark Twain got his nom-de-plume.) To ascertain the depth beneath the keel of a boat a heavy weight would be attached to a line. The line had knots in it at 6 feet intervals (known as fathoms). The linesman, and Mark Twain was one in his youth, would 'fathom' the depth of water by observing the moment that the weight touched the bottom and counting the knots in the line, each space representing a fathom. They would call out the depths, Mark One - one fathom, Mark Twain - two fathoms and so. (This is what they were doing in Acts 27:28) The 'lines' were long and the Acts 27 line measured 90 feet of water beneath their keel.

Soltua imagines people measuring the 'nature' of God with a 'sounding line'. When they come to the end of their line they conclude that such is the 'measure' of God. Soltua,says, they have only come to the end of their measuring capacity; they have not measured God!

One of the thorny terms in theology of God's nature is 'persons'. What is a person? and when we have defined it can we then apply that word separately to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The answer would seem to be 'yes' but we need to remind ourselves that 'person' is a human measure of nature, and as Soltau says 'our little line' has run out. In a sense when we attribute personhood to the Father, Son and Spirit we are saying only that 'at the very least 'He' is equal to human personhood in attribute and capacity. He is capable of separate self consciousness so the Father can speak to Son and Son to Spirit. This is but the edges of His nature. Soltau is right, the man whose theology does not cause him to bow down and worship is a waste of space. I fear he is right too in commenting that "Man can applaud his fellow; for, in so doing, he praises himself. He can approve the sayings of another; for, thereby, he constitutes himself a judge." There is room for a lot of pride in the exclusions of the theologians; whether amateur or professional.

I am a Trinitarian, but I note that no man was every thrown out of a local church for faulty theology in Bible times; that penalty was reserved for those who lived faulty lives.

**Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/6/20 11:14**

Hi Ron,

Quote:  
-----I am a Trinitarian, but I note that no man was every thrown out of a local church for faulty theology in Bible times; that penalty was reserved for those who lived faulty lives.  
-----

This is true, but isn't it also true that if a faulty theology is followed to it's natural conclusion it will lead to a faulty life?

In Christ,  
Jeremy Hulsey

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/20 11:46**

Good wisdom there Ron.

I had a thought yesterday and wondered if it could hold water. I will phrase it as a question;

"Will God still back the words with His unction when He is being misrepresented?" Which begs another question, "How accurate do our understandings of God have to be in order for God to 'anoint' the ministry?" (please excuse the way I use the word 'anoint', but for lack of a better term)

I base the thought on this passage:

*But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power. For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power. (I Corinthians 4:19-20)*

**Re: - posted by disciplejosh (), on: 2005/6/20 12:30**

Robert,

Just a thought as to the thread of thought here and the point/question you just asked...

Quote:

-----"Will God still back the words with His unction when He is being misrepresented?"  
-----

This, I think, depends upon the heart and the motive of the person declaring or expressing the words.

Moses misrepresented God knowingly. The consequences were serious.

Others misrepresent God ignorantly, from a humble heart of faith and a desire to be used of God.

God knows and searches the heart, the mind, the soul and the spirit of a man.

The unction that is from the Holy One is given as He sees fit to give. Of course, our Lord instructs us not to give what is holy to the dogs, and certainly He will not do the same.

The heart of man, my heart, your hearts, dear brothers and sisters, that is the object to consider...for from it spring forth the issues of life.

Quote:

-----"How accurate do our understandings of God have to be in order for God to 'anoint' the ministry?"  
-----

Now that's a question, brother!

How accurate are your understandings of God? How accurate are mine? Or Ron's? Or Mike's? Or Chanin's? Or Jeremy's? Or Rahman's? Or Greg's? Or Yolanda's? Or Ed's?

What a multi-faceted, many variegated thing is man's understanding or grasp or comprehension of God. How finite are my thoughts of You, O God. How shallow, how much on the perimeter are they...

My heart longs to swim and dive deep into the vastness that is God. I am reminded of a quote in Tozer's 'Pursuit of God'.

..

"Shoreless Ocean who can sound Thee?

Thine own eternity is round Thee,

Majesty Divine."

Maybe it is not so much the depth or comprehension of our understanding of our God (not to negate the need for knowledge and understanding as Solomon spares no space in Proverbs exhorting us to get understanding and knowledge with "all of our getting"), but the heat and fervency, the passion and the overwhelming crush of ardent desire that fills our hearts, souls, and minds, that spurs each of us on in the pursuit...to know Him intimately, passionately, personally.

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/6/20 14:37**

Quote:  
-----Maybe it is not so much the depth or comprehension of our understanding of our God (not to negate the need for knowledge and understanding as Solomon spares no space in Proverbs exhorting us to get understanding and knowledge with "all of our getting"), but the heat and fervency, the passion and the overwhelming crush of ardent desire that fills our hearts, souls, and minds, that spurs each of us on in the pursuit...to know Him intimately, passionately, personally  
-----

wow!  
That's a lofty goal but one we must all take. I believe your right. It would seem that we are enabled by His Spirit according to the light or understanding we have, however flawed that may be. A good example is that of D L Moody.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/20 14:41**

Quote:  
-----This is true, but isn't it also true that if a faulty theology is followed to its natural conclusion it will lead to a faulty life?  
-----

Yes, but that does not justify the 'thought police'.

**Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/6/20 14:44**

Quote:  
-----Yes, but that does not justify the 'thought police'.  
-----

Duely noted:-)

**Re:, on: 2005/6/21 7:31**

What do people have to say about the 7 Lamp Stands which are the 7 spirits of God? What do they make of Genesis when it says "let us make man after our own image"? Just curious.

Rejoicing in Him Whom I don't have to understand to love,

Lahry

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/6/21 8:29**

Quote:  
-----Yes, but that does not justify the 'thought police'.  
-----

This is very true. A few things I have observed is that there are those who have no idea how to explain deep doctrinal issues such as the Trinity and yet they still love God. If you asked them they would probably spill out all sorts of stuff and make us cringe if we let it. God still honors their faith. Some people simply don't care to be honest. It is not the area where they choose to express their faith.

Which leads me to my second observation and it is that it seems that some people do not have a real relationship with God- they express their religion in terms of studying and arguing theology. The whole of their Christendom seems to be expressed in terms of doctrines and a preoccupation with heresy. What a horrible way to express your faith in Christ in my estimation. To play on what Bro. Ron said- it is as though they walk around, not with their gun in the holster, but twirling it on their finger cocked and loaded- looking for a doctrinal shootout. When they fire their round and fit their foe they then blow the smoke from the end of the barrel. And it don't edify. It opens up questions and strifes about words that the folk I left to themselves would never think of. Finney deals with this and talks about how it is a sore distraction for preachers to bring up doctrines and shoot them down that noone even heard of.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by luke133, on: 2005/6/21 12:41**

I have studied some about this heresy and would highly recommend a book by Gregory Boyd, **ONENESS PENTECOSTALS AND THE TRINITY**. I think that it is important to understand that this view has an undeniable effect on the adherents' soteriology. 1John 2:23 says that whoever denies the Son does not have the Son or the Father. This doctrine in seeking to preserve the deity of Christ and the oneness of God destroys the Biblical doctrine of the Son. This teaching essentially denies the Incarnation, saying that the Son is simply Jesus' humanity and the Jesus is the Father taking over this human body at times. So rather than teaching that God became man, oneness doctrine teaches that God just put on a human mask from time to time. Needless to say it can get a little difficult at times trying to distinguish whether or not Jesus is speaking as God or man. Predictably though the modalists maintain that whenever Jesus alludes to His divinity He is speaking as God and whenever He makes distinction between Himself and the Father He is speaking as man. This is one of the BIG problems with this doctrine and for this reason Oneness followers should be seen in the same category as Russelites (JW's) and Mormons, sincerely deceived people in need of the Truth.

**Re: - posted by luke133, on: 2005/6/21 16:48**

By the way has anyone else noticed that the Pentecostal Sermons ad on the left hand side of the page is a oneness ministry?

**Re: You know....., on: 2005/6/22 8:03**

....I suppose I am one of the few who have never read a book by "bishop" Jakes. I've never listened to him speak more than 5 mins. It's not that I have anything against him, I just have never been led by the Spirit to pay attention to what he has to say.

Mega ministries are very difficult to manage. Having every word that is spoken by yourself scrutinized for accuracy is not something everyone could cope with. I don't envy him at all. Getting along here is tough enough. :)

When I stop and think of all the years that Billy Graham has been preaching the simple Gospel message and yet has been for the most part uncorrupted, that's an awesome life. He is probably one of the very few that have gotten through such a ministry unscathed by the high volume of cash flow.

Please pray for those you see on TV and in the "big" meetings. They have much pressure upon them and need all the grace they can get. No, I did not say agree with their doctrinal discrepancies. Just pray that they will walk with God more than they walk with man.

Humbly before Him,

Lahry

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/22 14:22**

Quote:  
-----This doctrine in seeking to preserve the deity of Christ and the oneness of God destroys the Biblical doctrine of the Son. This teaching essentially denies the Incarnation, saying that the Son is simply Jesus' humanity and the Jesus is the Father taking over this human body at times. So rather than teaching that God became man, oneness doctrine teaches that God just put on a human mask from time to time.  
-----

I don't think they are "seeking" to do anything of the sort. Most oneness guys I know will jump at the chance to discuss this issue with just about anybody. The problem is that they have been rejected as heretics by many who have never taken the time and persuade them with Scripture.

Again, I think that BOTH sides get WAY too specific in their definitions of the Godhead. Or at least it seems easy to go beyond Scripture to explain what we think Scripture means.

Quote:  
-----This is one of the BIG problems with this doctrine and for this reason Oneness followers should be seen in the same category as Russellites(JW's) and Mormons, sincerely deceived people in need of the Truth.  
-----

If you are so quick to do this, then this is on your head. However, it is not so simple for me to categorize them in this way. There are some HUGE fundamental differences between Oneness Pentecostals and the Cults. The biggest one is that they hold to Sola Scriptura.

Here's the tragedy: Most people won't take the time to go through the Scriptures with them. Unlike the JW's and Mormons I have talked to, the Oneness bunch WILL listen to and believe Scripture. (At least most of them)

So I think you have your work cut out for you, Luke 13. ;-)

RT

**Re: - posted by roman, on: 2005/6/23 2:08**

TO: ALL

Lately I have been in deep thought of this "Trinity." All the more when I heard of a doctrine that states this way:

- 1) The Father is God
- 2) Jesus is God the Son; He is also God
- 3) The Holy Spirit is not God but the Spirit of God.

They don't use the word "Trinity" as we call it but they just simply call it as God the Father, God the Son, Holy Spirit or the Spirit of God.

This doctrine says that Jesus has a beginning. He was born of God. One passage they are using is Proverbs 8:22 to 36 and I believe John 3:16 (begotten Son).

Question #1: What passage that speaks/proves that Jesus has no beginning?

Question #2: Any thought on "begotten Son" in John 3:16?

Question #3: Is there anywhere in the Bible that calls the Spirit of God as God?

Question #4: What's wrong in not calling the Holy Spirit as God but calling it as Spirit of God as the Bible calls it?

Thanks much.  
Roman

**Re: - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/6/23 4:33**

Quote:  
-----Question #1: What passage that speaks/proves that Jesus has no beginning?  
-----

Answer: Specifically in Micah 5:2 "But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; **whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.**"

Quote:

-----Question #2: Any thought on "begotten Son" in John 3:16?  
-----

Answer: Begotten by simple definition has to do with physical birth. We read in Gal. 4:4 that the Son was "made" of a woman. We read in Rom. 1:3 that Jesus Christ the Son was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh;"

Adam was a created son of God. The Word was "made flesh" and dwelt among us. I love these words taken from the (non-Biblical) epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus:

**"This is He who was from the beginning, who appeared as if new, and was found old, and yet who is ever born a fresh in the hearts of the saints."**

Isn't that just beautiful? God's Word is His Son which was begotten in the flesh in the fullness of time, yet by Him were all things created. Great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh. (1 Tim. 3:16 - encourage you to read the whole verse - KJV)

Quote:

-----Question #3: Is there anywhere in the Bible that calls the Spirit of God as God?  
-----

One quick place I can recall is in Acts 5:3,

(v. 3) "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to **lie to the Holy Ghost**, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

(v. 4) "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? **thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.**" (emphasis added)

Quote:

-----Question #4: What's wrong in not calling the Holy Spirit as God but calling it as Spirit of God as the Bible calls it?  
-----

I want to point you to these references where the pronoun "he" (John 14:16,17) as well as "it" (Rom. 8:16) are used. We read of: Comforter, Spirit of Truth, Holy Ghost, Spirit of God, Spirit of the Lord, to name a few. I'd go to your Bible and do a study on your own. This will probably serve you best.

1 John 5:7 "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

Hope this helps clear things up. If not let me know. Its getting pretty late.

Blessings,

RT

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/23 10:42**

There is some stuff here that new folks, who missed this topic the last time around, might profit from.

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id1783&forum36&start30&viewmodeflat&order0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id1783&forum36&start30&viewmodeflat&order0)) Should we believe the Trinity?

and in

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id3962&forum36&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id3962&forum36&post_id&refreshGo)) The Word became Flesh.

and in

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id445&forum36&post\\_id&refr](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id445&forum36&post_id&refr))



eshGo) The Trinity/Oneness Question.

and in

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id184&forum36&post\\_id&refr](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id184&forum36&post_id&refr)

eshGo) The Trinity - what are your views?

and in

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id242&forum36&post\\_id&refr](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id242&forum36&post_id&refr)

eshGo) Trinity and Hebrew Grammar

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/6/23 11:01**

roman asks:

Quote:

-----Question #1: What passage that speaks/proves that Jesus has no beginning?  
-----

The Gospel according to John has some profound christology. It begins by declaring that in the 'beginning' the Word already was. (This is a conscious echo of Genesis 1:1) This is the imperfect tense signifying a past-continuous characteristic or action. The same word and tense is then used of the Word which John declares 'was with God'. This is a fascinating construction. Greek has different words for 'with' e.g. meta=together with, para=with/by the side of. But this is 'pros ton theon' which really implies 'towards, with a sense of motion, God'. This speaks not of a sterile time/space positioning but of a living relationship. It almost gives the sense of God and the Word being in increasing intimacy. You will see that God and the Word at this point are distinguishable and are portrayed as being in a 'face to face' relationship. (the phrase is repeated at the end of verse 2) It goes on to use that same imperfect tense form of 'was' to say that the Word was God; this is indivisibility.

In John 1:1 you have the following christology

1. The Word co-existed with God at the beginning; that is co-equality.
2. The Word was distinguishable and in a definable relationship to God; that is unique personhood.
3. The Word was indivisible from God; that is monotheism.
4. The whole is tri-unity. Distinguishable persons living in a non-divisible oneness.

If the Son was already co-existing with the Father 'at the beginning' it can only mean that He had no beginning.

{The essence of the following is quoted by William D Mounce in 'Basics of Biblical Greek' 2nd Edition; page 27. He is quoting, in turn, from Daniel B Wallace.

-----  
In English the order of the words determines the meaning. eg 'the dog bit the boy' can only mean one thing. However in Biblical greek the meaning is usually determined by the 'case endings' of the words. In the above example the ending of the word 'dog' would show that this was the subject of the sentence, and the ending of the word 'boy' would show that this was the object of the sentence. Consequently, in Biblical Greek the word order might be 'the boy bit the dog' but the case endings of the nouns would make it crystal clear that it was the dog that did the biting. The order of the words in Biblical Greek is not primarily to convey meaning but emphasis. So eg in our illustration if the full story was 'a boy and a girl were playing with a dog; the boy bit the dog'. If the case ending showed that 'the dog' was the subject then this would have the effect of saying "both were playing with the dog, but the dog bit the boy". However in a sentence like 'god was the word' something else gives us the meaning. In these "equation" statements eg "the dog is an animal" the same case ending would be used for both; the nominative. This would make it impossible to know who bit whom, but the Greeks had a way around that too. The subject noun would be given the definite article 'the'. Now the word order of the sentence can be used to give the required emphasis but we can still identify the subject. The Greek for John 1:1 is "and god was the word". This is an "equation sentence" so how can we know which is the subject? Easy, the subject has the definite article. So why not write "the word was God"? Because the writer wants to emphasize something else. It is a way of saying "what God was, the Word was". The lack of the definite article stops us from identifying the person of 'the Word'(Jesus) with the person of 'God' (the Father). The word order tells us that the Word has all the divine attributes of the Father; the word order tells us that the 'the Word' is not 'the Father'. Martin Luther once wrote that the lack of the definite article disproves Sabellianism and the word order disproves Arianism. Here's a little more Bible algebra. If it had said

"and the Word was the God"-> Sabellianism (Jesus-Only/Oneness)

"and the Word was a god"-> Arianism (and JW's etc)

"and god was the Word"-> orthodox trinitarian.

Biblical Greek is capable of almost mathematical precision.